

REMARKS

Claims 68-90 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 68 and 79 are amended. Claims 18-34 are canceled. Support for the amendments may be found in at least Figs. 26 and 53. No new matter is added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims at least in light of the following remarks.

Claims 18-20, 22-26, 28-32 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,598,032 (Fidalgo) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,815,426 (Jigour) and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,694,399 (Leydier); and claims 21, 27 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fidalgo, in view of Jigour and Leydier, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,154 (Brewer). As claims 18-34 are canceled, the rejection is moot. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 68-75, 79-81, 84-88 and 90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,568,600 (Carpier) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,634,565 (Gray). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Carpier and Gray, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or to have rendered obvious "a pair of U-shaped circuits are formed so as to surround the IC chip on a surface of the substrate for the IC module opposite a surface of the substrate for the IC module on which the contact terminal plate is mounted in a manner where the IC chip is placed at a center portion of an area surrounded by the pair of U-shaped circuits," as recited in claims 68 and 79. The Office Action asserts that coils 66, 67 in Fig. 5A of Carpier correspond to the claimed pair of U-shaped circuits (the Office Action on pages 2 and 3). Carpier discloses a chip card equipped with a loop antenna. Carpier discloses that the coils 66, 67 are formed on a substrate 50C (Figs. 5A and 5B). Carpier discloses that the element 50C is a body of the chip card 5C (column 8, lines 24-26). Carpier also discloses that Fig. 5A schematically illustrates the chip

card 5C in a top view and that Fig. 5B illustrates the same chip card in a sectional side view (column 7, line 67-column 8, line 3). Thus, Carpier discloses that the coils 66, 67 are formed on a substrate 50C for the chip card (in other words, IC chip), but fails to disclose that the coils 66, 67 are formed on a substrate (e.g., 2C) for the IC module. Further, as Fig. 5A shows, Carpier fails to disclose that the semiconductor component 3 is placed at a center portion of an area surrounded by the coils 66, 67. Thus, Carpier fails to disclose the above feature, as recited in claims 68 and 79. Further, Gray fails to make up for the deficiency of Carpier.

Thus, Carpier and Gray, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or to have rendered obvious the above feature, as recited in claims 68 and 79.

Thus, claims 68 and 79 are patentable over Carpier and Gray. Further, claims 69-75, 80, 81, 84-88 and 90 are patentable for at least the same reasons, as well as for the additional features they recite. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 76-78 and 89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(b) as being unpatentable over Carpier in view of Gray and in further in view of Jigour; and claims 82 and 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(b) as being unpatentable over Carpier in view of Gray and in further view of Fidalgo. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

These rejections are premised upon the presumption that the combination of Carpier and Gray discloses, teaches or suggests the above features of claims 68 and 79. As discussed above, Carpier and Gray fail to disclose, teaches or suggest at least these features. Further, Jigour and Fidalgo fail to make up for the deficiency of Carpier and Gray. Thus, the rejections are improper. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

H. Yamashita

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Hirotsuna Yamashita
Registration No. L0563

JAO:HQY/ils

Attachments:

Request for Continued Examination
Petition for Three-Month Extension of Time

Date: February 17, 2010

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry of this filing;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461